Per Curiam

ARTEAGA *v.* UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

No. 97–6749. Decided February 23, 1998*

Held: Abusive filer's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied; and for the reasons discussed in *Martin* v. *District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1, he is barred from filing any further certiorari petitions in noncriminal matters unless he first pays the required docketing fee and submits his petition in compliance with Rule 33.1.

Motion denied.

PER CURIAM.

Pro se petitioner Lorenzo Arteaga seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to the Ninth Circuit. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the District Court's dismissal with prejudice of petitioner's complaint for failure to amend his complaints pursuant to the District Court's instructions.

We deny petitioner leave to proceed *in forma pauperis.* He is allowed until March 16, 1998, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38 and to submit his petition in compliance with Rule 33.1. For the reasons discussed below, we also direct the Clerk of the Court not to accept any further petitions for certiorari in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless he first pays the docketing fee required by Rule 38 and submits his petition in compliance with Rule 33.1.

Petitioner has filed 20 petitions with this Court, 16 in the past two Terms. All have been denied without recorded dissent. In 1997, we invoked Rule 39.8 to deny petitioner *in forma pauperis* status. *Arteaga* v. *California*, *post*, p. 804. Petitioner nevertheless has filed another frivolous petition

*Together with *Arteaga* v. *Wilson, Governor of California, et al.*, also on motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis.*

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

with this Court. In his petition and supplemental petition, Arteaga appears to assert that he is an innocent person falsely imprisoned and to allege numerous constitutional violations and conspiracies among prison, court, and government officials. He does not address the reasons for the District Court's dismissal.

Accordingly, we enter this order barring prospective *in forma pauperis* filings by petitioner in noncriminal cases for the reasons discussed in *Martin* v. *District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) *(per curiam)*.

It is so ordered.

JUSTICE STEVENS, dissenting.

For reasons previously stated, see *Martin* v. *District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1, 4 (1992) (STEVENS, J., dissenting), and cases cited, I respectfully dissent.